



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## INTRODUCTION

IN the development of this section on *Personnel* the effort has been made to interpret the words broadly enough to include all those carried on the payroll—managers, foremen, as well as the rank and file of other workers with hand and brain. We believe that in the industry of the future it will be expedient to emphasize the bases common to such jobs as, for instance, the president and the worker at the bench. The fact that two such employes perform different functions in behalf of a common enterprise is no argument for looking upon them as different varieties of human beings. Such assumptions in the past have led us into error.

The word *Personnel* has come to smack too much of welfare work. Welfare work has of course not been without its usefulness in the building up of American industry. But in so far as it has been imposed from the top and as a dole it will find no permanent place in the science of industry. The struggle must be in this as in every other phase of industry to have action not only based on truth but motivated from within the hearts and minds of the individuals affected by it. The problem is not so much to teach people to acquiesce in receiving as to build them up so that they will want, and even demand, those things which make for a virile and self-reliant industrialism.

We had planned one other paper for this section which partly on account of considerations of space we have been forced to omit. Its subject was to have been *Working and Living Conditions for the Workers*. We were the more willing to dispense with this particular paper in view of the very comprehensive treatment which the topic has received in several recent volumes of *The Annals*.

We have been very fortunate in the papers we have secured describing the various methods by which the organization of the workers is accomplished in these days when this phase of industry holds the center of the stage. In the article on the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America by Judge Moses we have an authoritative picture of a union which is audacious, powerful, closely knit and frankly stands for a radical re-organization of society. That its leadership has won to a very large extent the confidence

of the employers of the clothing industry is simply a mark of an unusual time.

It will be noted that of the two descriptions of so called "company unions"—the Midvale and the P. R. T.—one is written by a representative of the workers and the other by a representative of the management. A peculiar interest attaches to the story of the gradual enlargement of the worker's share in the conduct of the Consumers' Ice Co. of Detroit as is evidenced by their increasing representation on the Board of Directors until today they have an actual majority. The responsibility for this unique development is clearly shown in Mr. Brown's paper.

John Leitch's plan for *Industrial Democracy* has a great deal in it to fire the imagination of an American. It has already accomplished much good and doubtless is in for quite widespread adoption. The accomplishment of all that it claims to accomplish would be nearly a perfect goal for that type of manufacturer who would be willing "to concede a good deal to labor" if in return he could have the assurance of "peace." It would be unfortunate, however, in the opinion of the editor if because of any general adoption of this plan the models and mechanisms by which we have achieved some measure of political freedom should come to be considered as necessary to the accomplishment of our industrial freedom. We will be barred out from the higher reaches of efficiency if, for instance, we must institute in industry all the detailed checks and balances which have hung like mill-stones about our political life. To borrow an inspiring thought from Helen Marot it is *participation* and not representation which will bring about the ultimate democratization of industry.

Major Boyle's theories appear to run counter to much present day thinking. We certainly have gone too far in the direction of a mechanistic treatment of all employment problems. Industry needs to have injected into it more and more of the human-ness which Major Boyle advocates. But in so far as the author utilizes the old fashioned foreman for the execution of his program we believe he depends on an already overburdened reed. The day of the single foreman is gone. In the development of an efficient functional foremanship industry has a pretty task.

In studying these various schemes for the organization of the workers one must be careful not to place too much confidence in

the form of the organization. Almost any one of them may be the means in accomplishing all that it is desirable to attempt to accomplish in any given time. On the other hand there are reasons for believing that almost every plan that has been suggested is somewhere being used to thwart legitimate aspirations for—to use President Wilson's expression—"genuine democratization of industry, based upon a full recognition of the right of those who work, in whatever rank, to participate in some organic way in every decision which directly affects their welfare in the part they are to play in industry."

An employer who is desirous of accomplishing these great purposes can realize them under almost any plan. But no plan can effect them unless it is vitalized by high purpose and great determination.

The one indispensable element in the upbuilding of satisfactory industrial relations is confidence. To create it where it is non-existent is frequently an heroic task. To safeguard it and carry it to new levels will be the high enterprise of the industrial statesmen of the future.

MORRIS LLEWELLYN COOKE.